Document No.427
Adopted at Meeting of 3/25/65

RESOLUTION OF THE BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY THAT THE CHARLESTOWN PROJECT AREA IS AN ELIGIBLE URBAN RENEWAL AREA

WHEREAS, the Boston Redevelopment Authority (hereinafter called the "Authority") is a public body corporate and politic duly organized and existing under Chapter 121 of the Massachusetts General Laws and having its usual place of business in the City of Boston, Massachusetts; and

WHEREAS, the Authority, with financial assistance provided under Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, has undertaken and conducted surveys, studies and inspections of an area in the City of Boston known as the Charlestown Urban Renewal Project Area and described in Exhibit A, which is attached hereto and made a part hereof, (hereinafter called the "Project Area") in connection with the preparation of an Urban Renewal Plan therefor;

WHEREAS, there was submitted to the Authority at its meeting on February 25, 1965 a Project Area Report, which is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof, prepared by members of the Authority's staff describing the surveys and studies undertaken, the criteria used to determine the condition of structures, and the character, physical conditions, and uses of land and structures in the Project Area;

WHEREAS, there was submitted to the Authority a report entitled, "Report on the Removal and Relocation of the Charlestown Elevated Rapid Transit Structure", dated August, 1964, prepared by members of the staff of the Authority, (hereinafter called the "Mass Transit Report") on the blighting effect of the elevated mass transit facility located in the Project Area and operated by the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (hereinafter called the "elevated mass transit facility");

WHEREAS, the Authority has considered and reviewed the evidence and findings contained in the Project Area Report, the Mass Transit Report, and other evidence and opinions as to the condition of the Project Area submitted by members of the Authority's staff;

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby RESOLVED:

(1) That the Authority does hereby find and determine that the character and conditions of the Project Area as described in the Project Area Report do exist;

(2) That the Authority does hereby find and determine that the Project Area is at present a blighted, deteriorated and/or deteriorating area in that more than twenty percent of the buildings in the Project Area contain one or more building deficiencies such as, (i) extensive minor defects which, taken collectively, are causing certain buildings to have a deteriorating effect on the surrounding area, (ii) deteriorating conditions in certain buildings due to defects not correctable by normal maintenance, and (iii) defects in certain buildings to a point warranting clearance, and further that the Project Area contains more than two environmental deficiencies such as (i) overcrowding or improper location of structures on the land, (ii) detrimental land uses or conditions, including incompatible uses, structures in mixed use, and adverse influences from noise, smoke or fumes, (iii) unsafe, congested, poorly designed or otherwise deficient streets, and (iv) inadequate public utilities or community facilities contributing to unsatisfactory living conditions, and economic decline;

(3) That the Authority does hereby find and determine that the Project Area is at present a substandard area, wherein dwellings predominate, which, by reason of dilapidation, overcrowding, faulty arrangement or design, lack of ventilation, light or sanitation facilities, and a combination of these factors, are

detrimental to safety, health, welfare and sound growth of the community;

(4) That the Authority does hereby find and determine that the Project Area is at present a decadent area in that it is an area which is detrimental to the safety, health, welfare and sound growth of the community because of the existence of buildings which are out of repair, physically deteriorated, unfit for human habitation, obsolete, in need of major maintenance or repair, because much of the real estate in recent years has been sold for non-payment of taxes or upon foreclosure of mortgages, because buildings have been torn down and not replaced and which, under existing conditions, it is improbable that the buildings will be replaced, because of a substantial change in business and economic conditions, because of inadequate light, air and open space, because of excessive land coverage, and because diversity of ownership, irregular lot sizes, and obsolete street patterns make it improbable that the area will be redeveloped by the ordinary operations of private enterprise;

(5) That the Authority does hereby find and determine that the elevated mass transit facility has a major blighting effect on the surrounding area both along Main Street, which it traverses, and throughout the Project Area; and

(6) That the Authority does hereby further find and determine that the several building and environmental deficiencies found by the Authority to exist in the Project Area are present to a reasonable degree throughout the Project Area in such manner as to warrant including the entire Project Area as part of the Charlestown Urban Renewal Project.

APPLICATION FOR LOAN AND GRANT BINDER NO.
PART I: FINAL PROJECT REPORT
PROJECT NO. MASS. R-55

Charlestown Urban Renewal Area
Boston Redevelopment Authority
Boston, Massachusetts

EXHIBIT A: PERIMETER BOUNDARIES OF PROJECT AREA

That certain tract of land, referred to as the Charlestown Urban Renewal Area, situated in the City of Boston, County of Suffolk, and Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and bounded generally as follows:

Beginning at a point which is described by the intersection of the southwesterly property line of W. F. Schraffts & Sons at 529 Main Street, and the Service Road at Sullivan Square;

Thence proceeding in a southeasterly direction paralleling the southwest face of W. F. Schraffts & Sons Factory to intersect with the southerly sideline of the B & M Railroad right-of-way;

Thence turning and running in a generally easterly direction by various courses and distances along the southerly sideline of the Boston & Maine Railroad right-of-way to the easterly sideline of "A" Street;

Thence turning and running in a southwesterly direction along the easterly sideline of "A" Street to Medford Street;

Thence turning and running in an easterly direction along the northerly side of Medford Street to Terminal Street;

Thence turning and running in a generally northeasterly direction along the westerly side of Terminal Street to the B & M Railroad right-of-way;

Thence turning and running in a generally northeasterly direction along the southeasterly sideline of the B & M Railroad right-of-way;

Thence across the B & M Railroad right-of-way to the easterly property line of Wiggin Terminals, Inc., 50 Terminal Street;

Thence turning and running in a generally northeasterly direction along the easterly property line of said Wiggin Terminals, Inc., to the Mystic River U. S. Pierhead Line;

Thence turning and running in an easterly direction along the Mystic River U. S. Pierhead Line to a point intersecting with the extended westerly sideline of property of the U. S. Gypsum Company, 600 Chelsea Street;

Thence turning and running in a southwesterly direction along the westerly sideline of the said U. S. Gypsum Company property to the southerly sideline of said property;

Thence turning and running in a generally easterly direction along the southerly sideline of said U. S. Gypsum property to the easterly sideline of Chelsea Street;

Thence turning and running in a generally southwesterly direction along the easterly sideline of Chelsea Street to the northerly sideline of U. S. Navy Yard Gate No. 4;

Thence turning and running in a generally southeasterly direction along the extension of the northerly sideline of said Gate No. 4 to the intersection of 2nd Avenue;

Thence turning and running in a generally southwesterly direction along the westerly sideline of 2nd Avenue to a point intersecting with the extended southerly sideline of 3rd Street;

Thence turning and running in a generally southeasterly direction along the southerly sideline of 3rd Street to the westerly sideline of 1st Avenue;

Thence turning and running in a generally southwesterly direction along the westerly sideline of 1st Avenue to U. S. Navy Yard Gate No. 1;

Thence turning and running across Water Street to the easterly sideline of Gate No. 1;

Thence turning and running in a generally southwesterly direction along the easterly sideline of Water Street to the northerly property line of Massachusetts Port Authority Hoosac Pier No. 1;

Thence turning and running in a generally southeasterly direction along the northerly property line of Massachusetts Port Authority Hoosac Pier No. 1 to a point intersecting the easterly property line of said MPA Hoosac Pier No. 1;

Thence turning and running in a generally southwesterly direction by various courses and distances along the easterly property line of said MPA Hoosac Pier No. 1 and the U. S. Pierhead Line and the Massachusetts Harbor Line extended to the Boston-Cambridge city boundary line;

Thence turning and running in a generally northwesterly and westerly direction by various courses and distances along the Boston-Cambridge city boundary line to the intersection with the Boston-Somerville city boundary line;

Thence turning and running in a generally northerly direction along the Boston-Somerville city boundary line to a point which is the intersection of the Boston-Somerville city boundary line and the northwesterly sideline of property now or formerly owned by Food Centre Wholesale Grocery, Inc.;

Thence turning and running in a northeasterly direction along the northwesterly sideline of said property now or formerly owned by Food Centre Wholesale Grocery, Inc., and across the B & M Railroad right-of-way to a point on the northeasterly sideline of said right-of-way;

Thence turning and running in a southeasterly direction along the northeasterly sideline of said B & M Railroad right-of-way to a point which intersects the extended northwesterly sideline of Street "A";

Thence turning and running in a generally northeasterly direction along the extended northwesterly sideline of Street "A" to a point which is the intersection of the northwesterly sideline of Street "A" and the southwesterly sideline of Rutherford Avenue;

Thence turning and running in a generally northwesterly direction along the southwesterly sideline of Rutherford Avenue to Cambridge Street;

Thence turning and running in a generally northeasterly direction across Rutherford Avenue and the Service Road at Sullivan Square to a point which is the intersection of the northerly property line of W. F. Schraffts & Sons property at 529 Main Street, and the Service Road at Sullivan Square, which is the point and place of beginning.

EXHIBIT B

CHARLESTOWN URBAN RENEWAL AREA - PROJECT AREA REPORT

February 25, 1965

The Charlestown Urban Renewal Area (hereafter called the "Area") is bounded generally by Medford Street, the Mystic River, Navy Yard, Charles River, Boston-Cambridge boundary, Boston-Somerville boundary, Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square. The boundaries are described in the Notice of Public Hearing and are shown on map number 1 of the urban renewal plan, entitled, "Property Map and Perimeter Boundaries".

Survey and studies have been made of the Area by several public bodies, including representatives of the former Boston City Planning Board, the Building and Health Departments of the City, and the Boston Redevelopment Authority. In 1961, detailed survey and planning studies of the Area were undertaken by the Boston Redevelopment Authority during the preparation of a General Neighborhood Renewal Plan for the Charlestown area. During 1962 and continuing through 1964 additional detailed studies were conducted by the Authority during the survey and planning period in order to further evaluate the character and condition of the Area. These studies included an investigation and analysis of existing land uses, building conditions, social and economic characteristics, the condition of streets and related facilities, the condition of public buildings and facilities, and traffic conditions.

Sources of survey and study data included the U.S. Census of Population and U.S. Census of Housing in 1960 and previous census periods, the Sanborn Atlas, the Bromley Atlas, records and studies of the Boston City Planning Board, records of the Assessing, Building, Real Property, Parks and Recreation, Health, Fire, Police, Traffic, and Public Works Departments of the City of Boston, and actual field surveys made both by and for the Authority.

Deficiencies considered fall into two major categories: Environmental Deficiencies, and Building Deficiencies, and are described below:

Environmental Deficiencies

(1) Overcrowding or Improper Location of Structures on the Land

Charlestown's streets were originally laid out in 1629, then again on substantially the same lines after the fire of 1775. At the turn of the past century, its population numbered about 40,000. Its houses are predominantly, row, built up to lot lines. Although at present, the area's population is only half that of fifty years ago, the change that has occurred is in the reduction of dwelling unit density and in the literal evacuation of whole blocks occurring in conjunction with industrial encroachment and increased traffic flows in those areas. Remaining residential blocks retain their historic physical characteristics. Increases of car ownership render such characteristics obsolescent.

(2) Excessive Dwelling Unit Density

As a highly built up older urban area, Charlestown's average of about 50 dwelling units per residential acre is higher thansuburban standards. Under existing tight conditions, suitably located ancillary areas of proper size and scope do not exist.

(3) Obsolete Building Types Such as Large Residences or Other Buildings Which through Lack of Use or Maintenance Have a Blighting Influence

With the exception of public housing, only two residential structures have been built in the Charlestown Renewal Area during the last sixty years. Most housing dates back to the 1880's, and much dates back to the 1840's and 1850's. During these earlier periods most of the residential structures were built as single-family residences. Many of these have since been converted into multi-family dwelling types, some with lodging houses, and many for non-residential use. Improper conversions, insufficient maintenance, repairs, and improvements, have caused many structures to grow increasingly obsolete over time.

(4) Detrimental Land Uses or Conditions Such as Incompatible Uses, Structures in Mixed Use, or Adverse Influence from Noise, Smoke, or Fumes

A number of commercial and industrial, in many cases decadent, uses of land and buildings are to be found, particularly along Medford Street, Bunker Hill Street, Main Street, Rutherford Avenue and Chelsea Street, that are adjacent to or haphazardly mixed with land and buildings used for residential purposes, such as to create truck traffic, noise, dirt and unsightliness detrimental to these residential uses. In many cases commercial and industrial uses are mixed with residential uses within buildings, thus having a similar deteriorating effect on the residential uses.

An elevated transit line runs along Main Street the entire length of the urban renewal area. The noise, dirt, unsightliness and blighting effects generated by this facility have caused substantial deterioration on either side along the frontage of Main Street and throughout the area as a whole. The blighting effects of this structure have been separately documented, a special report previously submitted to the Authority for their consideration entitled: "Report on the Removal and Relocation of the Charlestown Elevated Rapid Transit Structure", August, 1964.

(5) Unsafe, Congested, Poorly Designed or Otherwise Deficient Streets

Charlestown is, in effect, a corridor connecting downtown Boston and adjacent employment areas with the populous areas to the Northwest. Many of the local streets are therefore carrying large "through" traffic volumes well above their intended capacities. The result is traffic congestion during peak hours and deterioration of the adjacent land and buildings. (See North Terminal Area Study, August, 1962, submitted previously to the Authority for their consideration. A continuation of these conditions will mean the eventual total decline of Charlestown's residential areas.

(6) Inadequate Public Utilities or Community Facilities Contributing to Unsatisfactory Living Conditions or Economic Decline

Public Utilities

Charlestown is served by the following underground utilities: sewerage, water mains, storm drainage and gas lines. There is a combined sanitary and storm sewer system in the area. The Metropolitan District Commission interceptor sewer for Charlestown also serves a portion of the cities of Somerville, Cambridge, and Belmont. Under normal conditions, the Charlestown interceptor, running to the Everett pumping station is adequate. At heavy storm flows, however, it becomes over-loaded. The tidal gates and regulator chambers whose purpose it is to alleviate overflow during storm conditions are for the most part inoperative in Charlestown. The result is a release of raw sewerage which passes directly into the Charles River, the Mystic River and the Boston Harbor, causing severe pollution of water resources.

The water system serving Charlestown is considered to be basically adequate. Deficiencies exist, however, in the corroded condition of the old water mains. (Source: Whitman and Howard, Inc. Engineers, 1962).

Schools

Except for the Harvard-Warren elementary school, opened in the spring of 1963, of the nine other public school buildings presently in use in Charlestown only two classrooms in the J. McDonald School and four in the O. Holden have been constructed at the elementary level in the twentieth century. Four of the seven elementary schools date from before 1880 and one dates from the 1890's. The Edwards Junior High School, although a fairly recent structure, is somewhat deficient in specialized facilities for a modern educational program. The junior high also lacks sufficient outdoor playspace because of its limited site. Limited sites are characteristic of all public schools in Charlestown. Only one elementary school has little more than one half acre in site area. The Charlestown High School similary is deficient in this regard.
(Source: Harvard Graduate School of Education, Center for Field Studies; 1962)

Recreation

Of the eight playgrounds and two playfields in the area, only the poorly located Ryan Playfield is satisfactorily equipped and maintained. The remaining nine are deficient in several respects, from poor surface condition to paucity of basic equipment and facilities. A deficiency also exists in meeting recreational space needs for the very young and the elderly. The age group presently being served are those between 6 and 18 years of age. Those under 6 and over 64 although comprising a large segment of the Population are virtually without facilities. (Source: Boston Redevelopment Authority; Surveys 1961).

Public Buildings

The three fire stations in Charlestown are inadequate structures. One dates from 1872, another was built in 1876, and the third in 1884. All lack sufficient space to service equipment for training and for expansion. In 1956, the Boston City Planning Board recommended that these be abandoned.

The Charlestown library was built in 1913. To serve adequately the community, the facility requires renovating and enlargement. (Source: Boston Redevelopment Authority, Surveys 1961).

(7) Other Significant Environmental Deficiencies

The large employment places adjacent to the residential areas (e.g., Navy Yard, Waterfront Industries along Mystic River, and processing plants along Rutherford Avenue), generate parking demands by commuting employees. This has had a deteriorating effect on the residential area. Automobiles are densely parked on vacant lots and along narrow residential streets well within the residential area. This condition has served to deprive local residents of parking space. It has impaired proper rubbish removal, snow removal, and street cleaning, and has generally impaired the attractiveness of the area as a residential community.

Building Deficiencies

The analysis of building deficiencies was undertaken under guidelines established by the federal urban renewal administration, to be found in Part 3 of the Urban Renewal Manual. Building deficiencies considered include the following:

1. Defects to a point warranting clearance.

2. Deteriorating conditions because of defects not correctable by normal maintenance.

3. Extensive minor defects which, taken collectively, are causing the building to have a deteriorating effect on the surrounding area.

4. Inadequate original construction or alterations.

5. Inadequate or unsafe plumbing, heating, or electrical facilities.

6. Other equally significant building deficiencies.

Under federal eligibility requirements, at least 20% of the buildings in the Area must contain one or more of the above listed deficiencies.

Field surveys of all of the 2810 principal buildings in the Area were made by representatives of the Authority between July, 1961 and December, 1962. Every structure was given an exterior inspection and a 38% sample of structures in residential use located throughout the Area were given interior inspections. Random sampling techniques were employed to insure that inspections undertaken accurately represented general conditions throughout all sections of the area. In addition to residential inspections, every structure in non-residential use in the project area was given an interior inspection.

Building Examination Schedules used in the field survey are maintained in the records of the project, and are available for inspection and review. These Building Examination Schedules used in the detailed interior and exterior inspections were based upon guidelines established by the American Public Health Association in their "Method for Measuring the Quality of Housing", adjusted for local conditions and considering the legal requirements for safe and sanitary structures found in local building and health codes.

All buildings for which these schedules were used were examined for the following:

(1) Existence of rooms less than seven feet by ten feet used for habitation.

(2) Building lacks two means of egress.

(3) Dwelling unit lacks two means of egress.

(4) Presence of enclosed rooms without windows used for habitation.

(5) Inside walls and ceilings - evidence of cracks.

(6) Inside walls and ceilings - base material loose and/or broken.

(7) Inside walls and ceilings - evidence of leaks.

(8) Flooring worn, loose and/or missing.

(9) Floors sagging and/or pitched.

(10) Central heating system deteriorated and/or inoperable.

(11) Lack of central heating.

(12) Lack of continuous hot running water.

(13) Lack of private kitchen.

(14) Lack of installed kitchen sink.

(15) Lack of installed range.

(16) Lack of lavatory.

(17) Lack of private bath.

(18) Lack of private toilet.

(19) Lack of toilet facilities.

(20) Toilet compartment inadequately ventilated.

(21) Dwelling units sharing kitchen.

(22) Dwelling units sharing toilet.

(23) Dwelling units sharing bath.

(24) Lack of two electrical outlets in each room.

(25) Installed electrical fixtures inoperable.

(26) Exposed electrical wiring.

(27) Vermin infestation evident or reported.

(28) Interior stairs worn, sagging and/or missing.

(29) Lack of lighting fixtures in public hallways.

(30) Egress obstructed.

(31) Supporting columns and/or piers loose, and/or deteriorated

(32) Framing split and/or deteriorated.

(33) Impervious basement floor broken and/or deteriorated or missing.

(34) Accumulation of combustible debris.

(35) Presence of dampness or water in basement.

(36) Plumbing corroded and/or leaking.

(37) Roof material loose, missing and/or deteriorated.

(38) Roof sagging or out of line.

(39) Chimneys deteriorated and/or out of alignment.

(40) Exterior siding loose, missing and/or deteriorated.

(41) Exterior walls out of plumb and/or horizontal alignment.

(42) Window frames, sashes and/or glass loose, broken, deteriorated and/or missing.

(43) Foundation walls deteriorated, sinking and/or out of line.

(44) Exterior stairs and/or railings worn, deteriorated, broken and/or missing.

Data gathered as a result of this survey was used to classify each principal building as (A) satisfactory, (B) having minor defects, (C) having extensive minor defects or (D) having major defects. Buildings classified as having either extensive minor defects or major defects were determined to be deficient buildings. Percentages for each of the above four categories for all buildings in the Area were arrived at by interpolation of the findings relating to the buildings on which interior surveys were performed. When deterioration was measurable in area or extent it was enumerated as such only in those cases where it exceeded 25 per cent of the length, area, surface or number of items in question. These defects reflect either the presence of blighting factors or conditions, and/or the absence of elements required for safety and sanitation.

Building deficiencies, when considered together with existing land uses, provide further indications of the nature and extent of blighted or blighting factors; and when considered together with environmental deficiencies, provide a basis for determining that blight and decadence exists to an extent warranting urban renewal assistance. Building deficiencies and their relation to land uses are summarized in the following paragraphs.

(1) Approximately 307 acres of land within the area are improved with buildings or other structures, and approximately 116 acres with streets. The total of improved land represents approximately 80 per cent of the total of about 519 acres of land lying within the perimeter boundaries of the urban renewal area. Improved land is distributed generally throughout the entire area.

(2) Approximately 158 acres of land within the area are devoted to uses which are residential in character exclusive of streets, alleys, and other public rights-of-way. Such land represents approximately 40 per cent of the land area excluding streets lying within the Area.

(3) Approximately 243 acres of land within the Area are devoted to uses which are non-residential in character including businesses, industries, and institutions. Such land represents approximately 60 per cent of the land area excluding streets within the Area.

Blocks characterized by non-residential uses are distributed generally throughout many sections of the Area. Within these blocks non-residential uses are intermingled with and adjoining uses which are residential in character.

(4) Approximately 2,776 buildings or 98 per cent of the total number of 2,810 principal buildings within the area are of non-fireproof or of frame construction.

(5) Approximately 264 buildings or 9 per cent of the total number of 2,810 principal buildings within the Area are devoted to uses which are non-residential in character including businesses, industries, and institutions. Such buildings are distributed generally throughout many sections of the entire area intermingled with and adjoining buildings devoted to uses which are residential in character.

(6) Approximately 161 buildings or 60 per cent of the total number of 264 principal buildings devoted to uses which are non-residential in character were found, based upon all surveys and inspections, to be buildings deficient in one or more respects.

(7) Approximately 1,179 buildings or 47 per cent of the total number of 2,493 principal buildings within the area devoted to dwelling uses were found, based upon all surveys and inspections, to be buildings deficient in one or more respects.

(8) Approximately 2,408 dwelling units or 38 per cent of the total number of 6,378 dwelling units within the Area were found, based on all surveys and inspections, to be in principal buildings deficient in one or more respects.

(9) Approximately 417 dwelling units or 7 per cent of the total number of 6,168 dwelling units enumerated for the Project Area by the 1960 Census of Housing were reported by the Census to be vacant.

(10) Approximately 1353 buildings or 48 per cent of the principal buildings within the project area were found, based on all surveys and inspections, to be deficient buildings.

(11) The detailed interior and exterior inspections of the principal buildings throughout the Area as a whole disclosed the following distribution of defects:

(a) 2579 or 91 per cent were found to have 1 or more defects.

(b) 1746 or 62 per cent were found to have 5 or more defects.

(c) 1047 or 37 per cent were found to have 10 or more defects.

(d) 552 or 19 per cent were found to have 15 or more defects.

(e) 822 buildings or 29 per cent, had foundation walls which were deteriorated, sinking or out of line.

(f) 591 or 21 per cent, had exterior walls which were out of plumb and/or horizontal alignment.

(g) 749 buildings or 26 per cent, had roofs which were sagging or out of line.

(h) 771 buildings, or 27 per cent, had exterior siding which was loose, missing or deteriorated.

(i) 769 buildings, or 21 per cent, had window frames, sashes and/or panes which were loose, broken and/or deteriorated or missing.

(j) 642 buildings or 23 per cent, had worn, sagging and/or deteriorated interior stairs.

(k) 611 buildings, or 22 per cent, had exposed electrical wiring.

(l) 264 buildings, or 9 per cent, had evident or reported vermin infestation.

(m) 1025 buildings or 36 per cent, lacked heat.

(n) 1103 buildings, or 37 per cent, had floors which were sagging or pitched.

(o) 1056 buildings, or 37 per cent, had flooring which was worn, loose, and/or missing.

(p) 526 buildings or 19 per cent, had evidence of leaks on inside walls and/or ceilings.

(q) 850 buildings, or 30 per cent, had loose and/or broken base material on inside walls and/or ceilings.

(r) 1098 buildings, or 39 per cent, had evidence of cracks in inside walls and/or ceilings.

Based upon the analysis of environmental deficiencies, building deficiencies, the relationship of building deficiencies to land use, and the trends observed during the survey and planning period, the Charlestown Urban Renewal Project Area falls within the eligibility requirements of federal and state law. A separate Urban Renewal Administration determination that the area fell within federal eligibility requirements was made in response to the Application for Loan and Grant submitted by the Authority January 24, 1964, which determination was announced February 4, 1965.